Applicant: Martin Willard et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 10527-522001 / 03-257

Serial No.: 10/715,636

Filed: November 18, 2003

Page : 8 of 9

## REMARKS

In the Action mailed September 28, 2007, the Examiner allowed claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-17, objected to claims 41-19, and rejected claims 18 and 21-25. Applicants above have amended independent claims 18 and 41 and canceled dependent claim 11. As such, claims 1-2, 4, 7-10, 12-18, 21-25 and 41-49 are pending. Applicants submit that the amendments are made to bring the case in condition for allowance.

#### Claim Amendments

Independent claim 18 has been amended above to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 19, which was canceled in the amendment filed June 25, 2007. Applicants note that claim 19 was not subjected to any prior art rejections.

Independent claim 41 has been amended to direct claim 41 to subject matter previously set forth in dependent claim 5, canceled in the amendment filed June 25, 2007. Applicants note that claim 5 was not subjected to any prior art rejections.

These amendments add no new matter. Accordingly, Applicant's submit that claims 11-2, 4, 7-10, 12-18, 21-25 and 41-49 are in condition for allowance.

## Claim Objections

Claims 41-49 stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-13. As discussed above, claim 41 has been amended to direct claim 41 to subject matter previously set forth in claim 5, canceled in the amendment filed June 25, 2007. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the claim objections.

# Claim Rejections -- 35 USC 102

Claims 18 and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ginsberg (5,989,238). Of these, claim 18 is an independent claim. As discussed above, claim 18 has been amended to incorporate the limitations that were previously set forth in dependent claim 19, which was canceled in the amendment filed June 25, 2007. Applicants submit that claim 18, as amended, is directed to subject matter that defines subject matter that is patentable over Ginsberg. Indeed, previously pending dependent claim 19 was not subjected to any rejections based on prior art.

Applicant: Martin Willard et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 10527-522001 / 03-257

Serial No.: 10/715,636

Filed: November 18, 2003

Page : 9 of 9

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 18 and 21-25 based on Ginsberg be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2, 4, 7-10, 12-18, 21-25 and 41-49 are in condition for allowance, and ask that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed due for this amendment. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/5/2007

Geoffrey P. Shipsides

Fish & Richardson P.C. 60 South Sixth Street

Suite 3300

Minneapolis, MN 55402 Telephone: (612) 335-5070 Facsimile: (612) 288-9696